

SOME REMARKS ON TWO TEXTS RELATED TO THE VINAYA
OF THE MAHĀSĀMĠHIKA-LOKOTTARAVĀDINS

In Celebration of Albrecht Wezler's 65th Birthday on 2 March 2003

0. Prefatory

0.0. In the field of Buddhist philology the literature of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins has become more and more important from various aspects. Some may be very interested in the peculiar linguistic system within the framework of Old and Middle Indic and others in the contents as reflected in the course of its formation and the transmission of Buddhist ideas particularly those of the schools and of the rise and evolution of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

0.1. This paper is intended more or less to supply supplementary notes to my previous survey of the Vinaya literature ¹. At the moment I am writing a few articles on the texts cited by Madhyamaka masters. They include interesting Vinaya literature ².

* A list of Sino-Japanese characters is appended in alphabetical order at the end of this paper.

1. A. YUYAMA, *Vinaya-Texte* (= *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*, herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1979).

2. Cf. A. YUYAMA, "Some Remarks on the Canonical Texts Quoted by Madhyamaka Masters", *IJBS: Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, III (Sarnath-Varanasi, 2002), p. 197-205, esp. p. 201: § 1.4 (cum n. 11).

1. *St. Petersburg Fragments of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra*

1.0. It is widely known that a great many important manuscript materials from Central Asia have been kept in St. Petersburg from the times of Imperial Russia³. Thanks to the painstaking efforts of the Soviet and Russian scholars, working for decades under difficult conditions, a number of important manuscripts have become known to us. Among others a pioneering work done by Vladimir Svjatoslavovič Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij after World War II will not be forgotten⁴. His constant hard work must have brought his life to a sadly premature close. Otherwise, we all could have enjoyed more valuable studies from his pen.

1.1. The old archives of N. D. Mironov are held in the custody of the Manuscript Department of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg. It was in 1961 that the Russian specialists were able to begin studying the materials therein. And only in 1994 they chance on those fragmentary manuscripts untouched for a century or more. A short but very lively article on the existence of this Vinaya literature of the Mahāsāṃghikas amazed me a great deal⁵.

3. Among many others see G. M. BONGARD-LEVIN and M. I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA, *Indian Texts from Central Asia (Leningrad Manuscript Collection)* (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Minor*, V) (Tokyo: IIBS = International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1986), v, 23 p.

Cf. also A. YUYAMA, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections: A Bibliographical Guide for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology* (= *Bibliographia Indica et Buddhica, Pamphlet*, II) (Tokyo: IIBS, 1992), xi, 28 p.

4. Cf. S. D. MILIBAND, *Biobibliografičeskij slovar' otečestvennyx vostokovedov s 1917 g.*, Kniga I (Moskva: Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk - «Nauka», 1995), p. 252b-253a.

Herewith I wish to cite a volume dedicated to him: *Problemy istorii jazykov : kul'tury narodov indii. Sbornik statej: Pamjati V. S. Vorob'eva-Desjatovskogo* (Akademija Nauk SSSR - Institut Vostokovedenija) (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1974), 268 p., 1 photo-frontisp.: see esp. "V. S. Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij (03.X.1927-02.VII.1956)", p. 3-7; "Bibliografija Trudov V. S. Vorob'eva-Desjatovskogo", p. 8-11; and G. M. Bongard-Levin i E. N. Temkin, "Raboty V. S. Vorob'eva-Desjatovskogo i issledovanie buddijskix tekstov iz kollekcii N. F. Petrovskogo", p. 12-19.

5. See E. N. TYOMKIN, "Unique Sanskrit Fragments of the 'Sūtra of Golden

1.2. In the first place it came as a great surprise to learn that it is an Indic version of the Vinaya belonging to the Mahāsāṃghikas. No Vinaya text of this school in Indic has yet been verified ⁶. Furthermore, the news that it was among the Central Asian manuscript collection gave me quite a shock. Thereafter, I immediately suspected that it might not belong to the Mahāsāṃghikas but, strictly speaking, to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins.

1.3. In fact, during his expeditions to Tibet in search of Buddhist literature Rāhula Sāṃkṛtyāyana (1893-1963) discovered a complete palm-leaf manuscript of the Indic version of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* ⁷ at the Monastery of Nōr, a one-day trip from the City of Gzīs-ka-rtse ⁸. He carefully read the colophon to find it belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins (*ibid.*, cum n. 2). No serious scholar should miss an absolutely exhaustive survey of his collection made by Frank Bandurski ⁹. This extremely important text was published in a somewhat misleading way by W. Pachow and Ramakanta Mishra and translated by Charles S. Prebish ¹⁰. Nathmal Tatia then brought out a self-professed revised edition ¹¹. It seems that the manuscript itself

Light' in the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies (Russian Academy of Sciences)", *Manuscripta Orientalia: International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research*, I, 1 (St. Petersburg-Helsinki, July 1995), p. 29a.

6. For further details about this literature see A. Yuyama, *Vinaya-Texte* (1979), p. 38: § 1.5, esp. p. p. 39: § 1.55-57.S.1 et 2!

7. Rāhula Sāṃkṛtyāyana, "Sanskrit Palm-leaf MSS. in Tibet", *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, XXI, 1 (Patna, March 1935), p. 42: XXXIX.1 (Serial No. 177).

8. For these places see A. YUYAMA, "Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā-Vyākhyā of Haribhadra – Preliminary Remarks –", *ARIRIAB*, IV (Hachioji-Tokyo, 2001), esp. p. 27-29 cum n. 2-10.

9. See FRANK BANDURSKI, "Übersicht über die Göttinger Sammlungen der von Rāhula Sāṃkṛtyāyana in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, III)", *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen von Heinz Bechert, Beiheft V) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), p. 9-126, esp. p. 96f.: Text Nr. 57: Catalogue No. Xc 14/60.

10. Cf. A. YUYAMA, *Vinaya-Texte* (Wiesbaden 1979), p. 40: § 1.61.S.1-S.1.e.

11. Cf. YUYAMA, *Vinaya-Texte* (1979), p. 40: § 1.61.S.1-S.2.

reads its colophon correctly: *samāptaṃ prātimokṣa-sūtraṃ ārya-mahāsāṃghikānāṃ lokottaravādināṃ madhyoddeśikānāṃ pāṭha iti //* ... (folio 44a) (ed. Pachow-Mishra p. 45.15-16, cf. p. 11; ed. Tatia p. 38.1). It is therefore a great pity that a revised and enlarged edition of an otherwise very useful work has recently appeared without any other revisions after half a century (first published in Santiniketan in 1955) ¹².

1.4. In fact, needless to say, the existence of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* of other schools, e.g. of the Sarvāstivādins, does not shock me too much ¹³. There have actually appeared plenty of reliable editions made from the Central Asian manuscripts. Georg von Simson of Oslo has fully inherited the German tradition of Buddhist Sanskrit philology, collecting manuscript materials with a meticulous survey of the primary and secondary literature and editing them critically with the utmost care and in full detail ¹⁴. In Russia, thanks to the painstaking endeavours of Gregory M. Bongard-Levin and Margarita I. Vorov'eva-Desjatovskaja, some terribly difficult fragments have been made known to us from the M. M. Berezovskij and of N. N. Krotkov Collections ¹⁵.

12. W. PACHOW, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pāli Versions*. Revised and enlarged edition (= *Buddhist Tradition Series*, edited by Alex Wayman, XXXI) (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000), xvi, 240 p. – Reviewed by Oskar von Hinüber, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, XLIV, 4 (WINTER 2001), p. 366f.

This was his thesis submitted to the University of Bombay and was originally published in the *Sino-Indian Studies*, IV, 1 (Santiniketan 1951), p. 18-46; IV, 2 (1952), p. 51-114; IV, 3-4 (1953), p. 115-193. Later on it appeared in book form (Santiniketan: Sino-Indian Cultural Society, 1955), (iii), 219, 34 p. – Reviewed by J. W. de Jong, *T'oung pao*, XLVII (1960), p. 155-157; KUN CHANG, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXXX (1960), p. 71-77. – cf. A. YUYAMA, *Vinaya-Texte* (Wiesbaden 1979), p. 47: App. 1.II.

13. Cf. YUYAMA, *Vinaya-Texte* (1979), p. 1: § 1.11.S.1-2 (for the bhikṣus), p. 3f.; § 1.12.S.1-2.

14. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders und Herbert Härtel herausgegeben von Georg von Simson. 2 Teile (= *Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden*, XI) (= *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Folge III, Nr. CLV & CCXXXXVIII) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986 & 2000), XXIV, 284 p.; VIII, 371 p. [Teil II: *Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I*].

15. *Pamjaniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz Cental'noj Azii*, Vypusk 2: Izdanie tek-

1.5. The *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* for the Bhikṣus of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins was made known rather early in the field of Buddhist philology¹⁶. It is a prime necessity, however, that most of the texts belonging to this school should be re-edited critically to meet the present standard. It is eagerly hoped, therefore, that more detailed reports on such an extremely important text among the St. Petersburg fragments will appear at no distant future.

1.6. Further in this connection the old Soviet Archaeological achievements in Central Asia are of great interest for those engaged in Buddhist philology¹⁷. It is widely expected that we will see Buddhist manuscript materials unearthed in these regions. A brief report of the discoveries of rare Buddhist literature surprised me more than a little¹⁸. Let us hope that their scholarly publications will appear one after another in the near future! I once made a short but comprehensive survey of Buddhist Sanskrit literature from Central Asia with extensive bibliographical notes¹⁹. Recent discoveries impel me to revise this survey, using updated bibliographical sources. However, I wish to hand on this kind of work to promising young scholars in the relevant fields of study.

stov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarij G. M. Bongarda-Levina i M. I. Vorov'evoj-Desjatojkoj (= *Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka*, LXXIII, 2) (= *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, XXXIV) (Mskva: Nauka, 1990), p. 185-206 [Berezovskij fragment p. 189-203, Plates 96-129 on p. 395-407 / Krotkov fragment, p. 204-206, Plates 130-131 on p. 408f.].

On these two collections see also BONGARD-LEVIN & VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKYA, *Indian Texts from Central Asia (Leningrad Manuscript Collection)* (Tokyo 1986), p. 10 & 9 respectively.

16. Cf. YUYAMA, *Vinaya-Texte* (1979), p. 40: § 1.61; also CHARLES S. PREBISH, *A Survey of Vinaya Literature* (= *The Dharma Lamp Series*, I) (Taipei: Jade Scepter Imprint – Jin Luen Publishing House, 1994), p. 61-65.

17. See e.g. BORIS A. LITVINSKY, *Die Geschichte des Buddhismus in Ostturkestan* [Deutsche Übersetzung aus dem Russischen von Maria Schetelich] (= *Studies in Oriental Religions*, edited by Walther Heissig and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, XLIV) (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999), XI, 130 p.

18. Cf. Boris Stavisky, "Buddhist Monuments of Ancient Merv", *Buddhists for Peace: Journal of the Asian Buddhist Conference for Peace*, III (Ulan Bator 1980), p. 29-33 (incl. 5 figs), esp. p. 33b (cum n. 3).

19. Cf. A. Yuyama, "Buddhist Sanskrit Literature Found in Central Asia", *Journal of Oriental Studies*¹, XXIII, 1 (Tokyo 1984), p. 68-92 [in Japanese].

2. *Bhadravyūha's Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana and Prakīrṇaka-caitya-lakṣaṇa*

2.0. Mention may be made here of an extant text to be found in the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins with reference to *stūpas / caityas*. It is entitled the *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana*, including the *Prakīrṇaka-caitya-lakṣaṇa* ²⁰. An incomplete palm-leaf manuscript in eight folios (missing folio 2) has been kept in the Bir Library of Kathmandu ²¹. This very interesting text did not escape the attention of Gustav Roth in Göttingen, who gave invaluable information about it as early as 1968 ²².

2.1. The name of the author is given in the text itself as Ācārya Bhadravyūha of the Lokottaravādins. However, it is to be regretted that no information as to who and what Bhadravyūha was has so far been detected. Although it is most interesting and important to notice that there was a scholar-monk who left this kind of work in his own name: ... *lokottaravādinā*<*m*> /... *bhadra-vyūhena kathyate* // (folio 1b1-2).

2.2. An ardent interest in this text has led Gustav Roth to bring out quite a few relevant papers ²³. Every scholar in the related fields of

20. Cf. YUYAMA, *Vinaya-Texte* (1979), p. 49: App. 1.IId. "Stūpa".

21. This manuscript is described in detail: *Śrī-Nepāla-rājakīya-Vīra-Pustakālayastha-pustakānāṃ Brhat-Sūcīpatram, yasyāyaṃ Bauddha-viśayakaḥ sap-tamo bhāgaḥ, tasyāyaṃ tṛtīya-khaṇḍaḥ* (= *Purātattva-Prakāśana-Mālā*, XXXIX) (1966), p. 128: "Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecanaṃ". For details about this catalogue see Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 8f.

22. GUSTAV ROTH, "Remarks on the Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana", *Professor Syed Hasan Askari Felicitation Volume* (= Supplementary Issue to *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*) (Patna 1968), p. 31-46. It is a pity that this is not included in his collected papers (Delhi 1986).

23. See e.g. GUSTAV ROTH, "Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa according to the Tibetan version of the Caitya-vibhāga-vinayodhāva-sūtra, the Sanskrit treatise Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana, and a corresponding passage in Kuladatta's *Kriyāsaṃgraha*", *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, edited by Anna Libera Dallapiccola in collaboration with Stephanie Zingel-Avé Lallemand (= *Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung*, LV) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980), p. 183-209.

This is fortunately included in his collected papers: *Indian Studies: Selected Papers by G. Roth*, edited by Heinz Bechert and Petra Kieffer-Pülz, published on the

study is indebted to him for his painstaking efforts. And at last he has published an edition of this text with an invaluable facsimile of the manuscript²⁴. It is important to note that Roth dates it back to the thirteenth century CE (*ibid.*, p. 207). He promises to bring out his commentary and indices separately (*ibid.*, p. 208). I hope that I have not already missed the publication. On their appearance research on this literature will take a further step forward.

2.3. Incidentally, Yasunori EJIMA also studied this literature together with Gustav Roth during his stay in Göttingen in 1972-1974. After his return to Tokyo he published a brief but informative communication on this particular topic²⁵. Thanks to his painstaking efforts, the description of the *stūpas* is identified with similar but not identical passages in the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas. The text is found in the Chinese version translated most probably in the 410s CE by Buddhahadra from Central India in collaboration with Fa-hsien after his travels abroad: Taisho No. 1425, Volume XXII p. 497b18-499a17.

2.4. The text represented by this single manuscript is by no means a canonical text. It is eagerly hoped, however, that a specialist will study this Indic text in close comparison with the Chinese. The Indic manuscript tradition looks as if it requires to be re-examined with more care. Let us pray for the appearance of a third version, either Indic, Tibetan or Chinese!

occasion of his seventieth birthday (= *Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica*, XXXII) (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1986), p. 241-277.

24. G. ROTH, "Edition of the *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecanaṃ* Including the *Prakīrṇaka-caitya-lakṣaṇaṃ*", *Dharmadūta: Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thich Huyên-Vi à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, dirigés par Bhikkhu Tampalawela Dhammaratana (et) Bhikkhu Pāsādika (Paris: Éditions You-Feng, 1997), p. 205-231 (facsimiles of the palm-leaf manuscript kept in the Bir Library on p. 224-231).

25. YASUNORI EJIMA, "<Research Notes> *Stūpa Literature of the Lokottaravādīns*", *tri-piṭaka*¹, CXII (Tokyo, May 1976), p. 1-8 [in Japanese].

3. Stūpa-/Caitya-Cult in Icons

3.0. Needless to say, this may well be a useful material when reconsidering a difficult issue in connection with *stūpa-/caitya*-worship in the history of Indian Buddhism. It is very widely known that Akira HIRAKAWA had constructed his theory on the rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism on the basis of *stūpa*-worship²⁶. Since then it has become one of the central issues for historians of Buddhist ideas. His theory has had a great influence particularly among Japanese Buddhologists.

3.1. In one of his earliest studies, Gregory Schopen had started to tackle the problem by closely re-examining the textual testimonies in the relevant literatures²⁷. He has then extended his theory on the basis of materials far beyond the textual evidence. This man of keen and sharp intelligence has pointed to the monastic lives of Buddhists in India²⁸. This approach has attracted a number of serious scholars who are either strongly in favour or opposed to it. It may be worth noting here that in a series of studies on the stream of Mahāyāna Buddhism Yūichi Kajiyama has offered an observation on the *stūpa*-worship with reference to the Prajñāpāramitā thought, particularly based on

26. See e.g. AKIRA HIRAKAWA, "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas [Translated from the Japanese by Taitetsu Unno]", *Memoirs of the Research Department of The Toyo Bunko (The Oriental Library)*, XXII (Tokyo 19623), p. 57-106.

27. Gregory Schopen, "The Phrase 'sa pṛthivīpradeśāś caityabhūto bhaver' in the *Vajracchedikā*: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna", *III*, XVII, 3/4 (Nov.-Dec. 1975), p. 147-181.

Incidentally, Schopen then raised an interesting issue with a full use of Gilgit manuscript materials: "Sukhāvati as a Generalized Religious Goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature", *III*, XIX, 3/4 (Aug.-Sept. 1977), p. 177-210.

28. All of his twelve relevant articles can be seen in GREGORY SCHOPEN, *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India (= Studies in the Buddhist Traditions: A Publication of the Institute for the Study of Buddhist Traditions, ... Ann Arbor, Michigan)* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997), xvii, 298 p.

We therefore eagerly await the appearance of his lectures delivered at Otani University in Kyoto 1996-1998. It will no doubt invite constructive arguments. In the meantime Nobuchiyo ODANI is to be congratulated for his selfless service in bringing out a Japanese translation of Schopen's complicated text^k.

the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in comparison with its Chinese versions²⁹. However, I am not prepared to join in such a difficult and controversial dispute.

3.2. In this paper I would limit myself to cite only some recent publications of much interest to the relevant topic. Giuseppe Tucci has drawn the attention of those who are interested in the subject through his work based on his thorough explorations into Indo-Tibetan monuments, as well as documents³⁰. It is indeed fortunate that Lokesh Chandra has brought out an English version together with his illuminating introduction containing further detailed illustrations (*ibid.*, p. v-xxxvi)³¹.

3.3. In this connection I would like among others to mention Mireille Bénisti, who has been publishing a series of enlightening works for decades. These publications have since become indispensable to those who are engaged in the relevant fields of study. She began her meticulous research from various angles on extensive literary foundations³².

3.4. As for the Amarāvātī monuments mention may also be made of a meticulous work published in a most reliable series of this kind from

29. Kajiyama seems to have started his series of studies with "Stūpa, the Mother of Buddhas, and Dharma-Body", *New Paths in Buddhist Research*, edited by Anthony K. Warder (Durham: Acorn Press, 1984), p. 9-16.

This is photomechanically reprinted in his collected articles in English and German, *Studies in Buddhist Philosophy (Selected Papers)*, edited on the Occasion of his Retirement from Kyoto University by Katsumi Mimaki et al. (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1989), p. 45-52.

30. See GIUSEPPE TUCCI, *Indo-Tibetica*, I: "Mc'od rten" e "Ts'a ts'a" nel Tibet indiano ed occidentale. Contributo allo studio dell'arte religiosa tibetana e del suo significato (= *Studi e Documenti*, I) (Roma: Reale Accademia d'Italia, Nov. 1932), 158 p., XLIII pl.

31. *Indo-Tibetica*, I. *Stupa: Art, Architectonics and Symbolism*, by Giuseppe Tucci, translated into English by Uma Marina Vesce, edited by Lokesh Chandra (= *Śatapiṭaka Series*, CCCXLVII) (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1988), xxxvi, 154 p., XLIII pl.

32. See Mireille Bénisti, "Étude sur le stūpa dans l'Inde ancienne", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, L, 1 (Paris 1960), p. 37-116 (including 12 figs.), XVII plates.

the British Museum³³. On this occasion I would like to announce the good news that J. Burgess's important report on Amarāvātī with another invaluable work by Georg Bühler on the Aśokan inscriptions found at Dhauli and Jaugaḍa has recently been reprinted³⁴.

3.5. Furthermore, I cannot miss out other meticulous research work offering fresh angles on somehow neglected topics³⁵. Mention must be made of a scholar, who has been active in literally digging out important stūpas in history³⁶. An iconological work has recently attracted my interest revealing its author's wide range of knowledge regarding subject matters in India and beyond³⁷.

4. Stūpa-/Caitya-Cult in Writings

4.0. Last but not least, a scholar endowed with a good eye for actual objects and a deep understanding of the relevant literature studied the stūpas in India most exhaustively. He is knowledgeable about every aspect of problems in the history of Buddhist evolution and has published a monumental work with eighty-two illustrations³⁸.

33. Robert Knox, *Amarāvātī: Buddhist Sculpture from the Great Stūpa* (Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Press, London, 1992), 247 p. (including many plates), 1 coloured frontispiece.

34. *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, surveyed in 1882*, by Jas. Burgess (= *Archaeological Survey of Southern India*, VI) (1886, reprinted 1996), x, 1-113 p., LXIX plates [Bühler on p. 114-131].

35. See e.g. NIELS GUTSCHOW, *The Nepalese Caitya: 1500 Years of Buddhist Votive Architecture in the Kathmandu Valley*. With drawings by Bijay Basukala and an essay by David Gellner (= *Lumbini International Research Institute, Monograph Series*, I) (Stuttgart-London: Edition Axel Menges, 1997), 328 p. (including many plates).

36. See among others Shōshin KUWAYAMA, *The Main Stūpa of Shāh-jī-ki Dherī. A Chronological Outlook* (Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, 1997), viii, 113 p. 28 ills. (between p. 108 & 109).

37. ADRIAN SNODGRASS, *The Symbolism of the Stupa* (= *Studies on Southeast Asia*) (Ithaca: Southeast Asian Program, Cornell University, 1985), v, 407 p. (including many ills.).

38. TAKUSHŪ SUGIMOTO, *Studies in Buddhist Stūpa-Cult in India* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1984)¹.

4.1. Being a humble philologist, I must frankly confess that my keen interest was aroused in this book, published with every possible care to bring out a detailed textual study of the *Avalokīṭā-sūtra* (Sugimoto, *op. cit.*, esp. p. 479-513), and to present in a supplementary part of this book an intelligible comparison of different versions in Indic, Tibetan and Chinese as well as Śāntideva's citations of it in his *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (*op. cit.*, "Supplement I", p. 1-101). The relevant texts are made available from the *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*, ed. Émile Senart, II (Paris 1890, reprinted Tokyo 1977), p. 293.16-294.1, 362.3-397.7; cf. ed. Radhagovind Basak, II (Calcutta 1965), p. 401.4-8, 483.1-536.5³⁹.

4.2. This Indic text has a corresponding Tibetan version entitled *Spyan-ras gzigs* translated by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye-śes-sde. These three names prove that the date goes back to the early ninth century CE. Reference may always be made to the so-called *Denkarma Catalogue*. This catalogue has drawn considerable dispute over the years of its compilation within the range of twelve-year cycle from CE 788, 800, 812, 824 till 848. But at the moment it is sensible to believe that it was most probably composed at the beginning of the ninth century CE⁴⁰.

4.3. Takushū Sugimoto has thus made close investigation into the relevant Tibetan version from the Kanjur in careful comparison with the corresponding versions: Peking No. 862, MU folios 361a6-275a6 in comparison with Derge No. 195, TSA folios 251a6-266a7 and Narthang No. 181, BA folios 404b3-427a7, and to the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* of Śāntideva, ed. Cecil Bendall (St. Petersburg 1897-1902, reprinted The Hague 1957), p. 89.15-90.3, 297.10-309.4; Chinese ver-

39. Cf. for further details A. Yuyama, *The Mahāvastu-Avadāna in Old Palm-leaf and Paper Manuscripts*, I (= *Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum*, XV) (Tokyo: UNESCO Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, 2002), p. 1viii: § 8.7-7d (*addenda bibliographica*) and p. 1xiv: § 9 (*a comparative table of contents*).

40. Cf. *Denkarma Catalogue*, ed. by Marcelle Lalou (Paris 1953), No. 157: (360 *śloka*), 1 *bam-po*, 60 *śloka*!. Catalogue numbers differ in the edition Shyuki Yoshimura (Kyoto 1950), i.e. No. 156: 1 *bam-po*, 60 *śloka*. Cf. also *Catalogue of Phodrang Lhankarma*, edited by Rabsal (= *The Dalai Lama Tibeto-Indological Series*, XVII) (Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1996), p. 34.21 (bottom)-35.1: ... / *bam-po gcig dañ śloka drug-cu*.

sion of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, ed. Taisho No. 1636: Volume XXXII, p. 93b24-26, 131b20-22, 131b20-132a8, 93b26-27, 132a9-132c10, 132c17-26, 133a3-4, 133a1-2, 7-8, 133a5-6, 9-133b13, 133b10-11, 14-19.

5. Conclusion in Brief

5.0. Quite a quantity of the literature belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins is now appearing before us. It is to be hoped that we will see more texts edited or re-edited critically. The time will then be ripe to further study them from various angles.

5.1. For example, before we draw a hasty conclusion with regard to the linguistic peculiarities, we need to make up a descriptive grammatical system of each text, or more precisely a single recension of a literature⁴¹. We shall then be able to integrate them to build up a system within the school and then proceed to the linguistic system of Buddhist Sanskrit as a whole. In this regard I cannot overlook an informative discussion on the language in a recent work fully revised and updated by Oskar von Hinüber⁴².

5.2. Those texts belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins thus attract a great deal of attention from specialists in various fields of study. This kind of accumulative work will simultaneously take a step forward towards reliable critical editions for the use of philologists and historians of ideas. Otherwise, in the field of history of

41. Cf. A. YUYAMA, *A Grammar of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A) (= Oriental Monograph Series, XIV)* (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies in association with Australian National University Press, 1973), esp. p. 2: § 1.4.

See also J. W. DE JONG, *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America* (Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing Co., 1997), p. 80 (cum n. 4).

42. See e.g. OSKAR VON HINÜBER, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. 2., erweiterte Auflage 2001 (= Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Literaturen Südasien, XX) (= Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse, 467)* (Wien: Verlag der Akademie, 2001), § 43-44: p. 68-71, esp. p. 70.

Buddhist ideas we will still remain at the stage of discussing problems, in a condition of uncertainty based upon a rough grasp of the thought from unreliable textual passages.

5.3. In connection with the *stūpa-/caitya*-cult the *Kriyāsaṃgraha* of Kuladatta cannot be neglected. It does not seem to have been fully studied by competent specialists. One cannot overlook its importance also from the viewpoint of *śilpa-vidyā*. I have recently made a critical survey of this literature of great interest with rather extensive bibliographical information for the sake of future philological research⁴³. Gustav Roth believes that Kuladatta was versed in the teachings of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and his *Kriyāsaṃgraha(-pañjikā)* is a modified version of the *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana* of this school⁴⁴. It is impossible, however, to judge at this stage if he was a Lokottaravādin, unless there appear a definitely clear evidence to prove that the school had actually survived until his time (cf. Yuyama, *op. cit.*, p. 27: § 0.1).

6. *Postscriptal Remarks: Mahāsāṃghikas and Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*

6.0. It is now hoped that hitherto unknown and unedited texts belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins will show up among the corpus, which is being unearthed in the Bāmiyān area and beyond. Particular attention may be made to the Martin Schøyen Collection at Oslo⁴⁵. Once upon a time this school may have spread their teachings to Central Asia.

43. See my "Some Philological Remarks on and around Kuladatta's *Kriyāsaṃgraha(-pañjikā)*", *ARIRIAB*, V: 2001 (Hachioji-Tokyo, 2002), p. 27-41.

44. Cf. Roth, "Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa according ..." (v. *supra* n. 23), p. 196 = *Indian Studies: Selected Papers by G. Roth* (Delhi 1986), p. 264; further Roth, "Remarks on the Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecanaṃ" (v. *supra* n. 22), p. 31-46.

45. Among others see Lore Sander, "Die 'Schøyen Collection' und einige Bemerkungen zu der ältesten Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Handschrift", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, XLIV (2000), p. 87-100. – cf. also A. Yuyama, "Random Remarks on and around the Mannerheim Fragment of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*", *ARIRIAB*, IV (Hachioji, Tokyo, 2000 / 2001), p. 66-68 cum n. 47-60.

6.1. In fact, Hsüan-tsang ^a (d. 664 CE) has given an interesting description of this oasis town of Bāmiyān ^b in his “Travels to the West”. There he saw several tens of *saṃghārāmas*, and several thousands of monks studying the teachings of the Lokottaravādins of the Hīnayāna (Taisho No. 2087: Vol. LI, p. 873b12-13).^{46c}

6.2. Mention may be made to another remarkable travel record by a Korean monk named Hui-ch’ao or Hye-ch’o ^d (704-?). He arrived in India by sea. After having stayed there for the period of about three years, he traveled back overland and visited Bāmiyān ^e around 727 CE. Hui-ch’ao does not refer to any specific school there, but to both the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna teachings being practised with great respect by a number of monks in a number of monasteries. Paul Pelliot had brought a rare manuscript back from Tunhuang (Fonds Pelliot chinois 3532 ⁴⁷ / Taisho No. 2089-1 ^f: Vol. LI, p. 976a 10-15)^{48g}:

“... highly revere the Three Jewels. There are many monasteries and monks. Both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna are practised. ...”⁴⁹

46. This was made clearly intelligible as usual by ÉTIENNE LAMOTTE, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien des origines à l'ère Śāka* (= *Bibliothèque du Muséon*, XLIII) (Louvain: Publications Universitaires – Institut Orientaliste, 1958), p. 597 = *History of Indian Buddhism* ..., translated from the French by Sara Webb-Boin under the supervision of Jean Dantinne (= *Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain*, XXXVI) (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, Université Catholique de Louvain / Louvain-Paris: Peeters Press, 1988), p. 540f.

Among many other annotated translations of Hsüan-tsang's *Travels* one cannot overlook the importance of a work published first in Tokyo 1971 by Shinjō MIZUTANI (1917-1995). It was recently reprinted in three volumes (Tokyo 1999) ^m. For Bāmiyān see Vol. I, p. 121-123 (with additional notes on p. 273 & p. 278f.).

47. *Catalogue des manuscrits chinois de Touen-houang: Fonds Pelliot chinois de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, IV: Nos 3501-4000, rédigé sous la direction de Michel Soymié (= *Publications hors série de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*) (1991), p. 20: No. 3532.

48. This text has been most carefully studied and published in 1992 under the leadership of Shōshin KUWAYAMA ⁿ with the assistance of Minoru INABA ^o: For Bāmiyān see *op. cit.*, p. 23 (text restored lines 151-155), p. 40f. (§ 21: Japanese translation), p. 144f. (detailed annotations by Kuwayama & Inaba), Facsimile Plate I.12-13 (lines 151-155).

For this work see e.g. Hubert Durt's introductory essay in: *Tsūshin* ^p: *Circulaire de la Société Franco-Japonaise des Études Orientales*, n° 16 (Kyoto-Tokyo, mars 1993), p. 17-21.

49. *The Hye Ch'o Diary: Memoir of the Pilgrimage to the Five Regions of*

6.3. From every angle in the field of Buddhist studies one cannot overlook the importance of Sylvain Lévi's work on the manuscripts discovered in Bāmiyān⁵⁰. All this has not escaped the attention of habitually discreet Oskar von Hinüber, who has convincingly identified a fragment with the *Bhikṣu-Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in his enlightening article⁵¹. From a different angle, however, Hisashi Matsumura has later put doubt about it in his article published in the same journal⁵². He concludes in the English summary of his article that "this fragment should be compared with the Chinese Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya, Taishō ed., vol. 22.307a-b and we do not have any decisive criterion for ascribing this fragment to the Mahāsāṃghikas or the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins exclusively." (p. 350). The title of his article will then become ambiguous. After all, his argument is not really persuasive to bring us over to his viewpoint. Edith Nolot has discussed it with more textcritical remarks with a question mark on the school to which it belongs⁵³. In any case there may be no doubt that the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins were flourishing once upon a time in the Bāmiyān area.

6.4. We must now seriously face a question as to the relation between the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Lokottaravādins as a last resort. I do not believe that this delicate question has not yet been fully discussed on the basis of documentary evidence with considerable persuasive power. Collecting more epigraphic evidence may well be one of

India.^b Translation, text and editing by Han-sung Yang, Yün-hua Jan and Shotaro Iida, Laurence W. Preston (= *Religions of Asia Series*, II) (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press – Seoul: Po Chín Chai Ltd., n.d. / ca. 1984), p. 52 (English translation), p. 100 (original manuscript in facsimile), p. 101.8-12 (text in transliteration).

50. SYLVAIN LÉVI, "Note sur des manuscrits sanscrits provenant de Bāmiyān (Afghanistan) et de Gilgit (Cachemire)", *Journal Asiatique*, Janv.-Mars 1932, p. 1-45, IV pl. — cf. Marcellé Lalou, *Bibliographie bouddhique*, IV-V (1934), p. 60: No. 182; also Yuyama, *Vinaya-Texte* (1979), p. 39: § 1.55-57.S.1 (Fragm); Prebish, *op. cit.*, p. 63 cum n. 29 on p. 119!

51. OSKAR VON HINÜBER, "A Fragment of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda-Vinaya from Bāmiyān", *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes*, IV (1986), p. 295-303, II plates.

52. Cf. H. MATSUMURA, "Encore à propos d'un fragment du Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya", *BEI*, VI (1988), p. 343-350.

53. EDITH NOLOT, "Derechef à propos d'un fragment du ? Mahāsāṃghika-Vinaya", *ibid.*, p. 351-358.

those, which will shed light on such problems. This will no doubt will help us understand the linguistics characteristics (cf. *supra* § 5.1) ⁵⁴. The fact that a number of “Mahāsāmghika” in its varied forms are found in the inscriptions at Mathurā should not go unheeded ⁵⁵. In this connection it is indeed welcoming to see the publication of a detailed comprehensive survey of Buddhist inscriptions in India in two voluminous parts with copious bibliographical references by Keishō Tsukamoto (in Japanese) ⁵⁶. It seems that the volume containing illustrations is yet to appear in the near future.

6.5. In search of the historical development of Buddhism Masao Shizutani had untiringly collected such inscriptional materials. It is a great pity that a series of his steady works attracted very little attention of his contemporary scholars. He had naturally kept his eyes on the schools to which they belong. As early as 1953 in the course of his research work Shizutani detected a single example of the epigraphic evidence for the “Mahāsāmghikas” among the inscriptions discovered around Mathurā. He noted it with considerable excitement in a book published in mimeograph for private circulation ⁵⁷. He has later on collected eleven inscriptions, which record the name of the

54. Cf. further e.g. OSKAR VON HINÜBER, “Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit”, *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes [Actes du Colloque International ...]*, Paris, 16-18 septembre 1986, édité par Colette Caillat (= *Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne*, LV) (Paris: Édition-Diffusion de Boccard, 1989), 341-367, esp. p. 342-344 et p. 353f.

55. Cf. e.g. GÉRARD FUSSMAN, “Documents épigraphiques kouchans (V). Buddha et Bodhisattva dans l'art de Mathura: Deux bodhisattvas inscrits de l'an 4 et l'an 8”, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, LXXVII (Paris 1988), “Extrait”: p. 22 (out of p. 1-25, V pl.).

56. K. TSUKAMOTO, *A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions*. 2 vols. (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1996-1998), Part I: Text, Notes and Japanese Translation (1996), xlv, 1068 p.; Part II: Indices, Maps and Illustrations (1998), xxiii, 491 p. – for the Mathurā inscriptions including the word *mahāsāmghika*- and its equivalents see Part I: Mathurā Nos. 69 (p. 662f.) [= Lüders-Janert § 79], 73 (p. 664) [= Lüders-Janert § 86], 84 (p. 668-674), 96 (p. 678) [= Lüders-Janert § 125], 101 (p. 680) [= Lüders-Janert § 134], 104 (p. 681f.), 116 (p. 685) [= Lüders-Janert § 157]. — For Lüders-Janert see *infra* n. 61!

57. MASAO SHIZUTANI, *Indian Buddhist Inscriptions in Kushāna Brāhmī Script (Texts and Translations with Notes)* [in Japanese ʹ] (Kyoto 1953), p. 21f.: No. 48 [= Lüders-Janert No. 79 / Tsukamoto: Mathurā 69].

Mahāsāṃghikas. Six out of them are from the Mathurā area including the one mentioned above⁵⁸. Incidentally, Shizutani's works have given a strong stimulus to a scholar at Berkeley to make a lengthy list of Buddhist schools with extensive reference available to him/her: *Indian Inscriptions Recording Buddhist Sect Names* (J. R., Berkeley, Dec. 1988)⁵⁹. The compiler has collected ten inscriptions belonging to the Mahāsāṃghikas (with copious handwritten notes in addition).

6.6. Further in connection with the beginnings of Buddhist art and Mahāyāna thought Mathurā must not be underestimated. Buddhist sculptures carrying inscriptions have now been attracting our increasing attention through a number of serious works in the past decades. Making good use of his long experience, R. C. Sharma has recently offered a fine guidebook to Mathurā⁶⁰. He demonstrates a beautiful Buddha statue, which carries the word *mahāsāṃghika-* or the like (p. 90f. with fig. 27).

6.7. In this connection, last but not at all the least, we cannot miss the pioneering work on the relevant inscriptions in the Mathurā region done by Heinrich Lüders⁶¹. The last one cited at the end of the foot-

58. Masao Shizutani, *Indian Buddhist Inscriptions in Kushāna Brāhmī Script* —, Part 2 [in Japanese] (Kyoto 1964), p. 55: No. 620 [= Lüders-Janert No. 79 / Tsukamoto: Mathurā 69]; p. 56: No. 623 [= Lüders-Janert No. 86 / Tsukamoto: Mathurā 73]; p. 58: No. 635 [= Lüders-Janert No. 125 / Tsukamoto: Mathurā 96]; p. 59: No. 639 [= Lüders-Janert No. 79 / Tsukamoto, p. 681f.: Mathurā 104; not in Lüders-Janert!]; p. 59: No. 641 [= Lüders-Janert No. 134 / Tsukamoto: Mathurā 101]; p. 61: No. 653 [= Lüders-Janert No. 157 / Tsukamoto: Mathurā 116]. — for Tsukamoto & Lüders-Janert see *supra* n. 56 & *infra* 61!

59. A note on the title cover runs as follows: "This list has been compiled on the information given in Shizutani Masao, *Shōjō bukkōshi no kenkyū*, Kyoto, 1978. Dubious inscriptions mentioned in other works are not included generally. For those inscriptions, consult the works in the bibliography."

60. R. C. Sharma, *The Splendour of Mathurā Art and Museum* (= *Perspectives in Indian Art & Archaeology*, I) (New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 1994), 211 p., XXIX col. ill., 82 b&w ill., maps, plan.

61. See e.g. HEINRICH LÜDERS, *Mathurā Inscriptions*. Unpublished Papers edited by Klaus L. Janert (= *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse*, III. Folge, Nr. 47), p. 171: § 134, with a facsimile of the inscriptions on p. 309 cum n. [= Tsukamoto: Mathurā 101]. Further in regard to this word (and its equivalents) see Lüders-Janert, *op. cit.*, p. 191f.: § 157 & p. 314 (facsimile)

note below (i.e. Lüders-Janert, p. 165: § 125) was excavated in a well at the mount of a village called Pālikheṛā, where there was once a *vihāra* of the Mahāsāṃghikas (cf. Lüders-Janert, *op. cit.*, p. 164f.)⁶². It may be noteworthy that this inscription dates back to the Gupta period according to Vāsudeva Śaraṇ Agravāla, who has brought out an unpublished catalogue made originally by Jean Philippe Vogel⁶³. Incidentally, Pālikheṛā Village is situated southwestward from the City of Mathurā on the way farther to the famed site of Sonkh built in the Kuṣāṇa era. It is fortunate that this archaeological site of great importance has been beautifully preserved⁶⁴.

6.8. Finally, I cannot help finish this paper with a single note on the discovery of the name of the Buddha Amitābha inscribed on the pedestal of a statue, installed in the Huiṣka year 26. It was really an exciting moment for me on my visit to Mathurā in June 1978 to see it among many other statues stored on the underground floor of the Mathurā Museum⁶⁵. I must now stop here! This may not be the place to discuss these questions furthermore.

[= Tsukamoto: Mathurā 116]; p. 114f.: § 79 & p. 292 (facs.) [= Tsukamoto: Mathurā 69]; p. 121: § 86 & p. 293 (facs.) [= Tsukamoto: Mathurā 73]; p. 165: § 125 & p. 306 (facs.) [= Tsukamoto: Mathurā 96]. – cf. *supra* n. 56: Tsukamoto!

62. Cf. further e.g. R. C. SHARMA, *Buddhist Art: Mathura School* (New Delhi, et al.: Wiley Eastern Ltd. – New Age International, 1995), p. 60.

63. Cf. V. S. AGRAWALA, "Buddha and Bodhisattva Images in Mathurā Museum", *Journal of the United Provinces (Uttar Pradesh) Historical Society*, XXI (Lucknow 1948), p. 92f. – For this somewhat complicated publication see *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*, XVI for the Years 1948-1953 (Leiden 1958), p. 207b-208a: Item No. 2412!

64. Cf. an elaborate work by Herbert Härtel, *Excavations at Sonkh: 2500 Years of a Town in Mathura District*. With contributions by Hans-Jürgen Paech and Rolf Weber (= *Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie*, IX) (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1993), 478 pages (incl. num. maps, plans, photos, figs., ills.).

65. Cf. R. C. SHARMA, "New Buddhist Sculptures from Mathura (Pre-Gupta Epoch)", *Lalit Kalā*, XIX (New Delhi 1979), p. 19-26, esp. p. 25f. (with Fig. 18); --, *Buddhist Art of Mathurā* (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1984), p. 232 (& Plate 151); --, *Buddhist Art: Mathura School* (1994) esp. p. 228 (& Pl. 146); --, *The Splendour* (1995), p. 142 (with Fig. 53).

List of Sino-Japanese Characters

- ^a 玄奘
- ^b 梵衍那
- ^c 伽藍數十所。僧徒數千人。宗學小乘說出世部。
- ^d 慧超
- ^e 犯引
- ^f 往五天竺國傳
- ^g ... 至犯引國。... 大敬三寶。足寺足僧。行大小乘法。
- ^h 往五天竺國傳
- ⁱ 湯山明, "中央アジアの梵語仏典", 東洋學術研究
- ^j 江島惠教, "<研究ノート> 説出世部の仏塔テキスト", 三藏/*tri-pitaka*, CXII (= 國譯一切經印度撰述部・月報)
- ^k 小谷信千代(訳), グレゴリー・ショペン: 大乘仏教興起時代・インドの僧院生活 (東京・春秋社, 2000), xii, 325, 8 p.
- ^l 杉本卓洲, インド仏塔の研究 — 仏塔崇拝の生成と基盤 — (京都・平樂寺書店, 1984), 21, 522, 112 p. + v, 23 p.
- ^m 水谷眞成, 大唐西域記, 1 (= 東洋文庫, No. 653) (東京・平凡社, 1999).
- ⁿ 桑山正進
- ^o 稻葉穰
- ^p 桑山正進編, 慧超往五天竺國傳研究 (= 京都大學人文科學研究所研究報告).
- ^q 靜谷正雄, ブラーフミー文字・インド佛教銘文・原文譯註 — クシャーナ時代 —
- ^r 靜谷正雄, インド佛教碑銘目録, I: グプタ時代以前の佛教碑銘 — ブラーフミー文字 —